

REMARKS

The Office Action mailed January 22, 2008 has been received and reviewed. Claims 1, 2, 4-15, and 17-28 stand rejected, and claim 21 stands objected to. Claims 1, 5, 14-15, 18, 20, and 27-28 have been amended herein. Claims 4 and 17 have been canceled. Claims 1-3, 5-15, and 18-28 remain pending. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the present Application.

Objections

Claim 21 stands objected to as being dependent on a rejected claim, but the Office Action notes that claim 21 would overcome the art of record if rewritten in independent form. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for pointing out allowable subject matter in claim 21.

Rejections based on 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-7, 13-20 and 26-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (Paul Johns, “Signing and Marking ActiveX Controls) in view of IE as illustrated by Microsoft, Schnoll, Acd.Ucar.Edu and Resource Kit. Independent claim 1 has been amended to include the following limitations: “ . . . an expert selection box listing a plurality of experts, the expert selection box allowing the user to select one or more of the plurality of experts.”

Applicant has carefully reviewed the art of record in light of these amendments. The asserted combination of references of record fails to teach or suggest providing an expert selection box listing a plurality of experts. Furthermore, as the Office Action considers the “Custom Level” and the “ready build” options in Internet Explorer to read on expert profiles, it appears that the Office Action characterizes Internet Explorer as an expert having multiple

profiles associated therewith. In contrast, amended independent claim 1 recites listing a plurality of experts from which a user can choose. The asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest this element. Moreover, the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest providing an expert selection box allowing the user to select one or more of the plurality of experts listed therein.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claim 1, as amended, is nonobvious over the art of record. Each of claims 2, 5-7, and 13 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1-2, 5-7, and 13.

Independent claim 14 has been amended to include the following limitations: “ . . . receiving a selection of one or more experts, wherein the one or more selected experts comprise one or more individual users other than the first user.” Applicant has carefully reviewed the art of record in light of these amendments. As discussed above, the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest a selection from among one or more experts. Furthermore, the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest experts comprising one or more individual users other than the first user. Specifically, as discussed above, the Office Action appears to characterize Internet Explorer as an expert. However, as Internet Explorer is an application, and therefore is, at best, a product of the various inputs of numerous programmers and developers, it cannot be fairly characterized as one or more individual *users* other than the first user.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claim 14, as amended, is nonobvious over the art of record. Each of claims 15, 18-20, and 26 depends, either directly or

indirectly, from independent claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 14-15, 18-20, and 26.

Independent claim 27 has been amended herein to incorporate the following limitations: “ . . . providing an expert selection box listing a plurality of experts, the expert selection box allowing the first user to select one or more of the plurality of experts.” As discussed above, with respect to amended independent claim 1, the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest these limitations. Independent claim 27 has been further amended herein to also incorporate the following limitations: “ . . . receiving a selection of one or more experts, wherein the one or more selected experts comprise one or more individual users other than the first user.” As discussed above, with respect to amended independent claim 14, the asserted combination of references also fails to teach or suggest these limitations, and therefore, the asserted combination of references fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of amended independent claim 27.

It is therefore respectfully submitted that independent claim 27, as amended, is nonobvious over the art of record. Claim 28 depends directly from independent claim 27. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that this dependent claim is nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 27 and 28.

Dependent claims 9-10, 11-12 and 22-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (Paul Johns, “Signing and Marking ActiveX Controls) in view of IE as illustrated by Microsoft, Schnoll, Acd.Ucar.Edu and Resource Kit (“Microsoft Internet

Explorer Resource Kit”, February 1998) and further in view of Windows OS as illustrated by Microsoft (“Microsoft “Windows 2000 User Profiles”, July 2003), and TechNet (Microsoft TechNet, “User Profile Structure” and “Appendix: Group Policy Setting for Roaming User Profiles”, March 2002). As discussed above, the combination of the Johns and IE references fails to render the amended independent claims obvious. Furthermore, the combination of the Windows OS and TechNet references fails to teach or suggest the amended limitations, nor is the combination relied upon as doing so. Combining both sets of references does nothing to alter the analysis. Each of claims 9-12 and 22-25 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 14 respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 9-10, 11-12 and 22-25.

Claims 1, 11-15 and 24-27 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Johns (Paul Johns, “Signing and Marking ActiveX Controls) in view of Windows OS as illustrated by Microsoft (“Microsoft “Windows 2000 User Profiles”, July 2003), TechNet (Microsoft TechNet, “User Profile Structure” and “Appendix: Group Policy Setting for Roaming User Profiles”, March 2002) and Hipson (Peter Hipson, “Windows 2000 Registry”, ISBN: 0782126154, 2000) and further in view of in of IE as illustrated by Schnoll. As discussed above, independent claims 1, 14, and 27 have been amended herein. As discussed above, the IE, Johns, Windows OS, and TechNet references fail, both individually and in combination, to render the independent claims obvious. Further, the Hipson reference does not teach or suggest, individually or in combination with the other references, the amended limitations recited in the independent claims, nor is it relied upon as doing so. It is therefore respectfully submitted that amended independent claims 1, 14, and 27 are nonobvious over the art of record. Each of claims

11-12, 15, and 24-25 depends, either directly or indirectly, from independent claims 1 and 14, respectively. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully submits that these dependent claims are nonobvious over the art of record for at least the above-cited reasons, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 1, 11-15, and 24-27.

CONCLUSION

For at least the reasons stated above, claims 1-3, 5-15, and 18-28 are now in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejections and allowance of the claims. If any issues remain that would prevent issuance of this application, the Examiner is urged to contact the undersigned – 816-474-6550 or jdickman@shb.com (such communication via email is herein expressly granted) – to resolve the same. It is believed that no fee is due, however, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any amount required to Deposit Account No. 19-2112.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jean M. Dickman/

Jean M. Dickman
Reg. No. 48,538

PAL/RCO/bp
SHOOK, HARDY & BACON L.L.P.
2555 Grand Blvd.
Kansas City, MO 64108-2613
816-474-6550